

FORMALITIES

Applicants again respectfully bring to the Examiner's attention that an Information Disclosure Statement was filed with the application on July 18, 2000. Accordingly, the Applicants request that in his next action, the Examiner consider the single reference contained therein and provide the Applicants with a copy of the Form PTO-1449 that has been duly initialed.

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 9 are pending in the subject application. Claims 1 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 10 and 11 have been newly added. Accordingly, after entry of this amendment, the pending claims will be claim 1 and claims 9-11.

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application. The Applicants, however, respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) REJECTION

The Examiner has again rejected claims 1 and 9 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,486,971 to Kawamoto ("Kawamoto" or the "Kawamoto Reference"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the above amendments and for reasons detailed below.

In his Response to Arguments, the Examiner agrees with the Applicant that, with Kawamoto, in the sub-scanning direction, the magnification process is dependent, i.e., not independent, on the magnification process in the main scanning direction. However, the Examiner asserts that, the opposite is not true, which is to

say that, in the main-scanning direction, the magnification process is independent of the magnification process in the sub-scanning direction. Accordingly, per the Examiner, Kawamoto – and more particularly, col. 7, lines 10-19 -- still reads on to claims 1 and 9.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the "write signal for the first-in, first-out memory is started earlier than a read signal therefor during enlargement, and the read signal for the first-in, first-out memory is started earlier than the write signal therefor during reduction". Advantageously,

by causing the write signal for FIFO (first-in, first-out) memory 4 to start earlier than the read signal therefor during enlargement, and causing the read signal for FIFO memory 4 to start earlier than the write signal therefor during reduction, there will be no occurrence of overtaking of addressing, and there will be no transposition in the lines of image data written to FIFO memory 4"

Specification, page 39, line 24 to page 41 line 5. Indeed, by causing the read processing to start earlier than the write processing and thereafter starting the writing of image data, the preceding line is read out, which is nearest in the cross-scan (sub-scan) direction to the image data line in the scan (main scan) direction during the write processing. Accordingly, the write processing is carried out only for the address that has been read out. Consequently, there is no possibility that the reading address will overtake the writing address.

In contrast, Kawamoto discloses that when enlarging an image, the writing operation and the reading operation for the FIFO memory are started at the same time, and when reducing an image, the start of reading operation for the FIFO memory is delayed in accordance with the magnification ratio from the start of the writing operation. See, e.g., Kawamoto, col. 9, line 37 to col. 10, line 21; Figs. 8 and 9. Accordingly, when the capacity of the FIFO memory is limited, it becomes complex to adjust the timing of the start of the reading operation. Furthermore, when reducing an image, it is necessary to adjust the timing for delaying the start of the reading

operation at each magnification ratio so that the reading address does not catch up with the writing address.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite that "the line memory output is connected in parallel to the plurality of image forming means." As a result, output values each having the same value are outputted in parallel to the plurality of image forming means, and magnification ratios can be controlled by the mere on/off operation of the gates. Advantageously, it is not necessary to carry out a complicated timing control for variable magnification of image data. In Kawamoto, however, there is no disclosure that the line memory outputs are connected in parallel to the plurality of image forming means.

The Applicants, therefore, believe that claims 1 and 9 are not anticipated by the Kawamoto reference and, further, satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 102(e). As such, the Applicants believe that claims 1 and 9 are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in a condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

The Examiner requests that the Applicants provide where in the prior art, FIGs. 11 and 12 are taught. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner refer to pages 1 and 2 of the specification.

The Examiner has also requested that the Applicants provide support for the newly added limitation to claims 1 and 9. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner refer to pages 35-37; pages 38-42; and pages 46-50.

The Applicants believe that no additional fee is required for consideration of the within Response. However, if for any reason the fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 3, 2005

By: 

George W. Hartnell, III
Reg. No. 42,639
Attorney for Applicant(s)

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(617) 517-5523
480865